

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
JANUARY 18, 2012 – 6:00 P.M.
TOWN HALL ANNEX – COMMUNITY ROOM 2

I. ROLL CALL

Regular members present: Munn, Pritchard, Roper, Steinfeld, Sherrard
Alternate members present: Fitzgerald, Zod, Kane
Staff present: Murphy, Oefinger, Schneider, Greenleaf, Cullen,
Doolittle

Chairman Sherrard called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

II. ITEM OF BUSINESS

1. 2013-2018 Capital Improvement Program – Review and Recommendations

Mark Oefinger, Town Manager, addressed and thanked the Commission for reviewing the CIP. He gave a brief overview of the CIP package, stating that it will be another tough budget year.

The Commission reviewed each project with Staff, and supported the CIP, as presented, noting the following:

1. Roads, A) Pavement Management Program Implementation - Town – Mr. Schneider reviewed each section listed under Roads and took questions and comments from the Commission. The Commission was concerned with spending more money in the long run on repairs by not maintaining the roads. The Commission supports this level to be spent on an annual basis to keep the roads safe and maintained. They requested that the council investigate other methods of funding to ensure the continuity of funding for the program, such as general obligation bonding.

1. Roads, F) Bridge Reconstruction – The Commission supported widening the span and providing a foot path.

1. Roads, I) Replacement of Defective Roadside Barrier Systems – The Commission and Mr. Schneider discussed the roadside barrier systems and the Commission felt that this should not be a priority item at this time.

1. Roads, J) Reconstruction of Intersection Crystal Lake Road/Military Highway – The Commission felt that this was a high priority item and felt that a monetary value be determined when the State completes the preliminary cost estimates.

2. Drainage and Watershed Protection, D) Judson Avenue Drainage – Mr. Schneider reviewed each section listed under Drainage and Watershed Protection and took questions and comments from the Commission. He noted that this is a potential referendum item. The Commission did not feel that this item was a high priority item.

3. Sidewalks, B) New Sidewalk Construction – Route 1, Mystic – Mr. Schneider reviewed each section listed under Sidewalks and took questions and comments from the Commission. The Commission felt that this was a high priority item in the area of Ice House Lane and High Meadow Lane.

3. Sidewalks, C) New Sidewalk Construction – Thomas Road – Mr. Murphy explained the conditions affecting the timetable for bikeway design on Thomas Road as well as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Trails Plan. The Commission felt that this was a very high priority item as well as a safety issue.

4. Parks & Recreation, D) Open Space Acquisition and Development – Staff and the Commission discussed this item and the consensus of the Commission was to support this item.

5. Education, A) School Design Phase II – School Security – Mr. Greenleaf reviewed each section listed under Education and took questions and comments from the Commission. He briefly explained why this was a CIP item as opposed to a Board of Education operating budget item. The Commission offered some suggestions to Mr. Greenleaf for the Phase II referendum.

5. Education, B) Asbestos Removal – Mr. Greenleaf explained that it was more cost effective to do this on a multi school basis and complete an entire building rather than one room at a time; the Commission agreed. The consensus was that these expenses would be necessary as a public safety concern.

6. Public Buildings, B) Police Station – Mr. Schneider reviewed each section listed under Public Buildings and took questions and comments from the Commission. Mr. Schneider explained the roof and firing range at the Police Station. The Commission's consensus was that this was a high priority item.

6. Public Buildings, L) Construction of Permanent Vehicle Wash Facility – Mr. Schneider explained the current wash facility. The Commission felt that this was a priority item.

8. Economic Development, C) Economic Assistance Fund – The Commission noted the importance of this item and indicated that they would support spending in FYE2013 if budget conditions would allow it. They felt that \$50,000 was an appropriate figure.

Mr. Oefinger and Staff thanked the Commission for their input into this year's CIP. Commission members noted the challenge of keeping the document readable as project descriptions expand.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 9:08 p.m. made by Sherrard, seconded by Munn, so voted unanimously.

Planning Commission

January 18, 2012

Page 3

Planning Commission

Prepared by Katie Doolittle
Office Assistant II